

COMMUNICATION.

FOR THE STANDARD.

To Gen. Edward B. Dudley:

Your letter accepting the nomination as the "Whig" party's candidate for Governor, is pronounced by one of your supporters to be "just as an eagle as the times demanded." That it meets the approbation, and may answer the purposes of those who called it forth, is not to be wondered at. But that it will be received by the friends of North Carolina, as containing sentiments and evincing feelings that they approve, is what I cannot believe.

The relation which [you] now bear towards the public, did indeed call for some exposition of your political opinions. Yet, instead of giving this exposition, your letter is filled with charges and insinuations against others, who are at least entitled to as much respect as yourself. At least, you may consider the approbation of those who are your political friends, as a sufficient reason for not exposing your political opinions. If you have the hardihood to flatter yourself that you are avoiding inquiry in regard to your own merits, but accusation is one thing, proof another. You, sir, have shown a liberal disposition to accuse—however feeble you may have been in proof. The very character of your proof only exposes the grounds of your prejudice. If you expect to convince the public by such exploded accusations, you are mistaken. The public have too long known the character of your witnesses, to give the least credit to their statements.

But what are your charges, and what the nature of your proof? You charge Mr. Van Buren with being a Northern man in soul, in new with being a Northern man in feeling, principle, and in action, with no real feeling of sympathy or of interest for the South—that he is an Abolitionist—that "he has belonged to all parties, and betrayed them all." These are your charges against him; and against his political friends in Congress, and in our Legislature, &c., you have had the hardihood to flatter yourself that you are avoiding inquiry in regard to your own merits, but accusation is one thing, proof another. You, sir, have shown a liberal disposition to accuse—however feeble you may have been in proof. The very character of your proof only exposes the grounds of your prejudice. If you expect to convince the public by such exploded accusations, you are mistaken. The public have too long known the character of your witnesses, to give the least credit to their statements.

Let us now examine your new charge, and see whether it is supported by proof, or founded in prejudice. You charge that Mr. Van Buren is an Abolitionist; and you, sir, are the first to make so bold a charge. Not even the Editors of the *Whig* press have had the hardihood to prefer such a charge; and if ever before made, it is alone to be found in the columns of Duff Green's Telegraph. The charge implies a willingness to see the Slaves of the South emancipated, and a disposition to have it effected no matter in what way, or by what means. Do you yourself believe the charge to be founded in truth? My respect for your understanding, however little I may have for your liberality or candor, forbids such a belief. You have uttered the charge under excited feelings, and for political effect; and you must, in your dispassionate moments, be forced to repeat it. What is your proof? He recorded opinions, you say, upon the subject of Slavery—his course on the Missouri question—his support of Rufus King—and his letter to a certain gentleman in Georgia. I must again remark, that the whole of this proof was in possession of the public before the last election, was then examined, and satisfactorily explained. It has been established by those who were on the spot and had the best means of knowing, that Mr. Van Buren's "course" on the Missouri question was such as the restrictions decidedly condemned. In proof of this, I might ask you of those who were the most active in gaining the Missouri question, are not among the bitterest opponents of Mr. Van Buren? Was not John Sergeant, his ablest champion on the floor of Congress? And yet he was the candidate for Vice President, at the last election, on the Clay ticket, and was supported and voted for by at least one (and he at the head of the list) of the "Whig" committee on whose invitation you have become a candidate—by many others who are now your political friends—and may have been by your self, for aught I know. Will you venture to say that those who vote for a man to office, thereby approve of all his opinions? Then, according to this kind of proof, many of your friends and supporters are Abolitionists. You, yourself, nominated Mr. Meares for Governor, at the last session of the Legislature, and voted for him, as did all your party. Yet they have refused to bring Mr. Meares before the public as your candidate, because of his federal opinions. By your own rule, however, you are to be charged with your friends' opinions, and ought to be as obnoxious to the public on that account as he is. Thus far, your proof is turned against yourself and friends, if it is entitled to any respect; how far that is the case, is left to others to decide.

Let us now examine your new charge, and see whether it is supported by proof, or founded in prejudice. You charge that Mr. Van Buren is an Abolitionist; and you, sir, are the first to make so bold a charge. Not even the Editors of the *Whig* press have had the hardihood to prefer such a charge; and if ever before made, it is alone to be found in the columns of Duff Green's Telegraph. The charge implies a willingness to see the Slaves of the South emancipated, and a disposition to have it effected no matter in what way, or by what means. Do you yourself believe the charge to be founded in truth? My respect for your understanding, however little I may have for your liberality or candor, forbids such a belief. You have uttered the charge under excited feelings, and for political effect; and you must, in your dispassionate moments, be forced to repeat it. What is your proof? He recorded opinions, you say, upon the subject of Slavery—his course on the Missouri question—his support of Rufus King—and his letter to a certain gentleman in Georgia. I must again remark, that the whole of this proof was in possession of the public before the last election, was then examined, and satisfactorily explained. It has been established by those who were on the spot and had the best means of knowing, that Mr. Van Buren's "course" on the Missouri question was such as the restrictions decidedly condemned. In proof of this, I might ask you of those who were the most active in gaining the Missouri question, are not among the bitterest opponents of Mr. Van Buren? Was not John Sergeant, his ablest champion on the floor of Congress? And yet he was the candidate for Vice President, at the last election, on the Clay ticket, and was supported and voted for by at least one (and he at the head of the list) of the "Whig" committee on whose invitation you have become a candidate—by many others who are now your political friends—and may have been by your self, for aught I know. Will you venture to say that those who vote for a man to office, thereby approve of all his opinions? Then, according to this kind of proof, many of your friends and supporters are Abolitionists. You, yourself, nominated Mr. Meares for Governor, at the last session of the Legislature, and voted for him, as did all your party. Yet they have refused to bring Mr. Meares before the public as your candidate, because of his federal opinions. By your own rule, however, you are to be charged with your friends' opinions, and ought to be as obnoxious to the public on that account as he is. Thus far, your proof is turned against yourself and friends, if it is entitled to any respect; how far that is the case, is left to others to decide.

Let us now examine your new charge, and see whether it is supported by proof, or founded in prejudice. You charge that Mr. Van Buren is an Abolitionist; and you, sir, are the first to make so bold a charge. Not even the Editors of the *Whig* press have had the hardihood to prefer such a charge; and if ever before made, it is alone to be found in the columns of Duff Green's Telegraph. The charge implies a willingness to see the Slaves of the South emancipated, and a disposition to have it effected no matter in what way, or by what means. Do you yourself believe the charge to be founded in truth? My respect for your understanding, however little I may have for your liberality or candor, forbids such a belief. You have uttered the charge under excited feelings, and for political effect; and you must, in your dispassionate moments, be forced to repeat it. What is your proof? He recorded opinions, you say, upon the subject of Slavery—his course on the Missouri question—his support of Rufus King—and his letter to a certain gentleman in Georgia. I must again remark, that the whole of this proof was in possession of the public before the last election, was then examined, and satisfactorily explained. It has been established by those who were on the spot and had the best means of knowing, that Mr. Van Buren's "course" on the Missouri question was such as the restrictions decidedly condemned. In proof of this, I might ask you of those who were the most active in gaining the Missouri question, are not among the bitterest opponents of Mr. Van Buren? Was not John Sergeant, his ablest champion on the floor of Congress? And yet he was the candidate for Vice President, at the last election, on the Clay ticket, and was supported and voted for by at least one (and he at the head of the list) of the "Whig" committee on whose invitation you have become a candidate—by many others who are now your political friends—and may have been by your self, for aught I know. Will you venture to say that those who vote for a man to office, thereby approve of all his opinions? Then, according to this kind of proof, many of your friends and supporters are Abolitionists. You, yourself, nominated Mr. Meares for Governor, at the last session of the Legislature, and voted for him, as did all your party. Yet they have refused to bring Mr. Meares before the public as your candidate, because of his federal opinions. By your own rule, however, you are to be charged with your friends' opinions, and ought to be as obnoxious to the public on that account as he is. Thus far, your proof is turned against yourself and friends, if it is entitled to any respect; how far that is the case, is left to others to decide.

Let us now examine your new charge, and see whether it is supported by proof, or founded in prejudice. You charge that Mr. Van Buren is an Abolitionist; and you, sir, are the first to make so bold a charge. Not even the Editors of the *Whig* press have had the hardihood to prefer such a charge; and if ever before made, it is alone to be found in the columns of Duff Green's Telegraph. The charge implies a willingness to see the Slaves of the South emancipated, and a disposition to have it effected no matter in what way, or by what means. Do you yourself believe the charge to be founded in truth? My respect for your understanding, however little I may have for your liberality or candor, forbids such a belief. You have uttered the charge under excited feelings, and for political effect; and you must, in your dispassionate moments, be forced to repeat it. What is your proof? He recorded opinions, you say, upon the subject of Slavery—his course on the Missouri question—his support of Rufus King—and his letter to a certain gentleman in Georgia. I must again remark, that the whole of this proof was in possession of the public before the last election, was then examined, and satisfactorily explained. It has been established by those who were on the spot and had the best means of knowing, that Mr. Van Buren's "course" on the Missouri question was such as the restrictions decidedly condemned. In proof of this, I might ask you of those who were the most active in gaining the Missouri question, are not among the bitterest opponents of Mr. Van Buren? Was not John Sergeant, his ablest champion on the floor of Congress? And yet he was the candidate for Vice President, at the last election, on the Clay ticket, and was supported and voted for by at least one (and he at the head of the list) of the "Whig" committee on whose invitation you have become a candidate—by many others who are now your political friends—and may have been by your self, for aught I know. Will you venture to say that those who vote for a man to office, thereby approve of all his opinions? Then, according to this kind of proof, many of your friends and supporters are Abolitionists. You, yourself, nominated Mr. Meares for Governor, at the last session of the Legislature, and voted for him, as did all your party. Yet they have refused to bring Mr. Meares before the public as your candidate, because of his federal opinions. By your own rule, however, you are to be charged with your friends' opinions, and ought to be as obnoxious to the public on that account as he is. Thus far, your proof is turned against yourself and friends, if it is entitled to any respect; how far that is the case, is left to others to decide.

Let us now examine your new charge, and see whether it is supported by proof, or founded in prejudice. You charge that Mr. Van Buren is an Abolitionist; and you, sir, are the first to make so bold a charge. Not even the Editors of the *Whig* press have had the hardihood to prefer such a charge; and if ever before made, it is alone to be found in the columns of Duff Green's Telegraph. The charge implies a willingness to see the Slaves of the South emancipated, and a disposition to have it effected no matter in what way, or by what means. Do you yourself believe the charge to be founded in truth? My respect for your understanding, however little I may have for your liberality or candor, forbids such a belief. You have uttered the charge under excited feelings, and for political effect; and you must, in your dispassionate moments, be forced to repeat it. What is your proof? He recorded opinions, you say, upon the subject of Slavery—his course on the Missouri question—his support of Rufus King—and his letter to a certain gentleman in Georgia. I must again remark, that the whole of this proof was in possession of the public before the last election, was then examined, and satisfactorily explained. It has been established by those who were on the spot and had the best means of knowing, that Mr. Van Buren's "course" on the Missouri question was such as the restrictions decidedly condemned. In proof of this, I might ask you of those who were the most active in gaining the Missouri question, are not among the bitterest opponents of Mr. Van Buren? Was not John Sergeant, his ablest champion on the floor of Congress? And yet he was the candidate for Vice President, at the last election, on the Clay ticket, and was supported and voted for by at least one (and he at the head of the list) of the "Whig" committee on whose invitation you have become a candidate—by many others who are now your political friends—and may have been by your self, for aught I know. Will you venture to say that those who vote for a man to office, thereby approve of all his opinions? Then, according to this kind of proof, many of your friends and supporters are Abolitionists. You, yourself, nominated Mr. Meares for Governor, at the last session of the Legislature, and voted for him, as did all your party. Yet they have refused to bring Mr. Meares before the public as your candidate, because of his federal opinions. By your own rule, however, you are to be charged with your friends' opinions, and ought to be as obnoxious to the public on that account as he is. Thus far, your proof is turned against yourself and friends, if it is entitled to any respect; how far that is the case, is left to others to decide.

vote of 163 to 47, express "the same thing, and so thing more." It only asserts that "Congress ought not to interfere with Slavery in the District of Columbia." This was voted for by Mr. Van Buren's friends, and opposed by nullifiers and abolitionists. And for this, judges, from the temper of your letter, you are prepared to unite with that mass of *Whigs* in denouncing him, as traitors to the South!

The recorded opinions of Mr. Van Buren, prove him to be opposed, upon constitutional grounds, to any interference with the question of Slavery. These opinions are satisfactory to every Southern man who, in his heart, desires an end of the question. It is only those who, like yourself, wish to agitate and keep alive the excitement, and turn it to political effect, that are dissatisfied. You deceive yourself. Our people are not quiet, whilst you would persuade them that all is quiet and agitation; and that the very "ords of the confederacy" are likely to be cut asunder. If the confederacy be in danger, it is owing to such inflammatory and rash spirits as yourself.

But, say you, Mr. Van Buren is a Northern man—"he is not of us!" and therefore is not to be supported by the South? I regret to find such a sentiment advanced by one who is a candidate for office in our State. If we are to act upon such a principle, it is not to be expected the non-slave holding States will be driven to do likewise? Was this the feeling that animated our forefathers, when they proclaimed themselves free and independent? Was the feeling of the Father of his Country, when he invoked his countrymen to unite every thing like sectional prejudice? Has this been the feeling which has governed the Republicans of the North for the last forty years, in their support of Southern men for President? These are questions which ought to put you to the blush, unless you be dead to every feeling of pride and patriotism.

Your charge, that Mr. Van Buren has belonged to all parties and betrayed them all, is one of those never-fading political flourishes, that is too common-place, and has been too often repeated, to have deserved a place even in your bitter epistle, replete as it is with such libelous, unfounded slanders, and exploded accusations. The answer to it is, that he has uniformly and unwaveringly acted with the Republicans of his own State; has filled the highest offices by their choice; has been, on all occasions, as he is on the present, opposed by the federal party—and still enjoyed the confidence of the purest patriots in the land. His political course has been marked and approved by the virtuous *Madison*, and the venerable *Madison*,—to say nothing of other men in the South, who have long known and acted with him in Congress, and who are as much alive to "our interests and institutions" as Gen. Edw'd B. Dudley and his "Whig" friends and associates.

Your charge against the Republican members of the last Legislature, that they practised evasion, and a time-serving policy, accords with the rest of your letter. How far it is well founded, is not my purpose to inquire. The fact that the charge is made by you, is not evidence with me of its truth. You have shown yourself too much blinded by prejudice, and too easily duped by false appearances, to be entitled to credit, where the conduct of political opponents is concerned. You may be deceived yourself, but you cannot deceive others, by such false clamour.

As you have manifested so ready a disposition to prefer charges against others, let me in return prefer charges against you. You are, I think, entitled to the same interrogatories. If you are not bound to answer the writer of this, you are at least bound to make public your opinions, before you can expect the support of the friends of the State.

Were you in favor of renewing the charter of the United States Bank? Do you approve of the charter which has been recently granted by the Legislature of Pennsylvania? And will you favor the introduction of Branches, or Agencies, in this State? Or, will you unite in forbidding their notes being circulated amongst us?

Do you admit the right of Instruction, or do you approve of Mr. Manning's course in refusing to obey?

Were you not in favor of South-Carolina nullification? Did you not, when in Congress, vote against the appropriation asked for by Gen. Jackson, for removing the Indians West of the Mississippi? If yes, what were your reasons assigned in your printed circular?

When you shall "candidly and manfully" meet these questions, then the public will be able to decide how far you are entitled to its support.

A REPUBLICAN.

And neither set of resolutions brought forward by the joint committee on the subject in our last Legislature, goes one whit farther than Mr. Van Buren. He pronounces it wrong, "inexpedient," for Congress to touch the subject; and the committee's resolutions say no more—in fact, they concede the power to Congress. And these resolutions were supported and voted for by General Dudley himself.—Ed.

A WORD FOR THE POOR.

Sir: Under the head of "Bondage," you have, in your last week's Standard, given a very distressing account of the situation of the poor in Europe. I read it with some degree of confidence, as to the truth of the statement, till I came to the following: "Among the labouring classes of the industrious Scotch, meat, except on Sundays, is rarely used. Now what must be inferred from this, but that the people of Scotland are under bondage to the nobles; and that they are in a state of starvation, having, like the other countries mentioned, to subsist upon 'gruel, chestnuts,' &c. during six days of the week. Such, at least, would be the construction put upon it by all unacquainted with the present condition of that enlightened country."

Is it possible, under these circumstances, that industrious as they are, they could give to their sons that liberal education, which gains them honor and preferment in every quarter of the world? Instead of their being in subjection to the aristocracy, they are a free and independent people; pay no direct taxes; yet, by means of the Parochial Schools, established by law, and supported by the land holders, they are enabled to give all their children an education adapted to their station in life. They have meat at table every day; and though it grows not under a variety of complicated and highly seasoned dishes, yet is there not wanting an abundance of good substantial food, pleasing to the palate, and imparting a strength and vigour to the body, unknown to the partakers of the former. The wages of the poor, I confess, are small, owing to the dense population; yet their clothing and other necessities are in proportion.

How the Review, from which you copied, came to place such an article in its columns, I cannot determine; but this I know, that what little I have said is drawn from actual observation, as many of your most respectable citizens could testify. Spare, then, the feelings of all from the mother country; the fresh wound cannot bear to be too roughly handled. Do justice to the "industrious poor" by publishing this, and you will confer a favour on their friend and well wisher, from

MARJERY O' THE MONTY LOCHS.

We very cheerfully give place to the above. The article alluded to, we copied from some one of our exchange papers, (taken originally from the North American Review) as affording a striking contrast between the abundant means of subsistence in our country, and the scanty supplies

of food among the poor in Europe generally. We are very ready to admit, that England and Scotland, relatively speaking, form an exception to the picture drawn by the Reviewer of the scanty means of subsistence enjoyed by the poorer classes in the old world. But we recollect to have heard, at least one emigrant from "Scotia" say, himself, that in some parts of his country, the indigent portion of the population would consider it an extravagant indulgence (even where they could well afford it) to gratify themselves with the luxury of meat often than two or three times a week. In Ireland, it is a well established fact, that perhaps a million of the inhabitants do not possess the means of obtaining meat often than once a week—while thousands do not see a point of flesh in their pots for months together. With regard to what our correspondent says about the general diffusion of education throughout Scotland—the industry, enterprise, and sterling virtues of the Scotch people—we are well persuaded he has done his country no more than sheer justice. Scotland is proverbial for her admirable system of education; and her people, famed, the world over, for their learning, their intelligence and enterprise. EDITOR.

FRANKING PRIVILEGE.

The following Letter of President Jackson, vindicating himself from the charges made by the opposition—that he had unlawfully and unconstitutionally abused the franking privilege in addressing several copies of the Extra Globe, to members of the Tennessee and Alabama Legislatures, cannot fail to be satisfactory to all who are disposed to listen to a candid and honest explanation. That the President did not overstep the boundary of his right, and that in respect to himself and his country, he was compelled to resort to this course, is plainly and candidly stated by him. The letter is addressed to Mr. A. O. P. Nicholson, a distinguished member of the Tennessee legislature, and was not intended for publication. We will now censure the President for the abuse of this privilege?

GEN. JACKSON'S LETTER.

Washington, Dec. 18, 1835. Sir: Having understood that exceptions have been taken to the liberty I took in addressing to some of my fellow citizens, the Extra Globe which contained Col. Benton's speeches, enforcing the adoption of his resolution, to expunge from the journals of the Senate certain proceedings of that body condemning my conduct in the removal of laws and Comptroller, and not improving to place your possession of the general considerations which induced me to take that liberty.

By my oath of office, I am not only bound to support the Constitution of the United States, but to guard, protect and defend it, to the best of my abilities. Mr. Clay's resolution arraigning and trying me without a hearing, violated the rights of the House of Representatives, to which, as the grand inquest of the Nation, exclusively belongs the power of impeachment. The Senate, by the Constitution of the United States, are expressly denied the right of originating impeachments, and cannot assume without usurping the powers conferred upon the other co-ordinate Branches of the Government. Yet in defiance of the Constitution, those resolutions were introduced into the Senate, and acted upon by that body; and according to their language, I was declared guilty of violating the laws and Comptroller, and not improving to place your possession of the general considerations which induced me to take that liberty.

I have manifested so ready a disposition to prefer charges against others, let me in return prefer charges against you. You are, I think, entitled to the same interrogatories. If you are not bound to answer the writer of this, you are at least bound to make public your opinions, before you can expect the support of the friends of the State. Were you in favor of renewing the charter of the United States Bank? Do you approve of the charter which has been recently granted by the Legislature of Pennsylvania? And will you favor the introduction of Branches, or Agencies, in this State? Or, will you unite in forbidding their notes being circulated amongst us? Do you admit the right of Instruction, or do you approve of Mr. Manning's course in refusing to obey? Were you not in favor of South-Carolina nullification? Did you not, when in Congress, vote against the appropriation asked for by Gen. Jackson, for removing the Indians West of the Mississippi? If yes, what were your reasons assigned in your printed circular? When you shall "candidly and manfully" meet these questions, then the public will be able to decide how far you are entitled to its support.

A REPUBLICAN.

And neither set of resolutions brought forward by the joint committee on the subject in our last Legislature, goes one whit farther than Mr. Van Buren. He pronounces it wrong, "inexpedient," for Congress to touch the subject; and the committee's resolutions say no more—in fact, they concede the power to Congress. And these resolutions were supported and voted for by General Dudley himself.—Ed.

A WORD FOR THE POOR.

Sir: Under the head of "Bondage," you have, in your last week's Standard, given a very distressing account of the situation of the poor in Europe. I read it with some degree of confidence, as to the truth of the statement, till I came to the following: "Among the labouring classes of the industrious Scotch, meat, except on Sundays, is rarely used. Now what must be inferred from this, but that the people of Scotland are under bondage to the nobles; and that they are in a state of starvation, having, like the other countries mentioned, to subsist upon 'gruel, chestnuts,' &c. during six days of the week. Such, at least, would be the construction put upon it by all unacquainted with the present condition of that enlightened country."

Is it possible, under these circumstances, that industrious as they are, they could give to their sons that liberal education, which gains them honor and preferment in every quarter of the world? Instead of their being in subjection to the aristocracy, they are a free and independent people; pay no direct taxes; yet, by means of the Parochial Schools, established by law, and supported by the land holders, they are enabled to give all their children an education adapted to their station in life. They have meat at table every day; and though it grows not under a variety of complicated and highly seasoned dishes, yet is there not wanting an abundance of good substantial food, pleasing to the palate, and imparting a strength and vigour to the body, unknown to the partakers of the former. The wages of the poor, I confess, are small, owing to the dense population; yet their clothing and other necessities are in proportion.

How the Review, from which you copied, came to place such an article in its columns, I cannot determine; but this I know, that what little I have said is drawn from actual observation, as many of your most respectable citizens could testify. Spare, then, the feelings of all from the mother country; the fresh wound cannot bear to be too roughly handled. Do justice to the "industrious poor" by publishing this, and you will confer a favour on their friend and well wisher, from

MARJERY O' THE MONTY LOCHS.

We very cheerfully give place to the above. The article alluded to, we copied from some one of our exchange papers, (taken originally from the North American Review) as affording a striking contrast between the abundant means of subsistence in our country, and the scanty supplies

GOV. TAZEWELL'S SUBTERFUGE.

Below will be found the message of Governor Tazewell, giving his reasons for declining to transmit the Instructing Resolutions to the Virginia Senators, as requested by the Legislature.

This message is the veriest piece of official twaddle we have for a long time met with. It is a weak effusion—contradictory, and inconclusive; and nothing but the madness of partisan feeling could have betrayed Gov. Tazewell into so puerile a step.

In the House of Delegates, Tuesday, Feb. 23, the Speaker communicated the following letter from the Governor—which was read by the Clerk:

Executive Department, Feb. 22, 1836. Sir: Inclosed is a communication for the House of Delegates, which will be pleased to lay before that body.

Respectfully, your ob't serv't, LITTLETON W. TAZEWELL.

To the SPEAKER of the House of Delegates.

To the House of Delegates. I have just received a paper containing the Preamble and resolutions adopted by the General Assembly upon the subject of expunging from the journals of the Senate of the United States, a resolution of that body, and relative to the right of instruction, were passed by this General Assembly, on the 20th day of the present month (February, 1836); and by one of the said resolutions the Governor of this Commonwealth was requested to transmit the same to each of the Senators from Virginia in the Congress of the United States, with a request that they lay the same before the Senate; and whereas the Governor of this Commonwealth has refused to transmit the aforesaid preamble and resolutions in pursuance of the request aforesaid, and contrary to the usage of the Executive of this State: Therefore,

Resolved, &c. That the Speakers of the Senate and House of Delegates, be, and they are hereby requested forthwith to transmit the aforesaid preamble and resolutions to each of the Senators from Virginia in the Congress of the United States, with a request that they lay the same before the Senate of the United States.

By the last of the resolutions contained in this paper, I am requested to perform two several acts. I am desired to transmit these resolutions to each of the Senators from Virginia, in the Congress of the United States, and also to accompany this communication with a request to the Senators, on my part, that they would lay the same before that body of which they are members.

Neither of these acts I am thus requested to perform is embraced within the sphere of any duty assigned to the Governor of this Commonwealth, either by its Constitution or laws; but, as neither is thereby prohibited to him, I should not have hesitated to comply with the requests of the General Assembly, if by doing so, I was not obliged to add my approbation to their resolves, and to unite my solicitation to their commands. Such a conclusion, however, is inevitable for the terms employed in the resolutions, as well as the very nature of one of the acts I am thereby requested to perform, announce plainly, that both these acts are considered by the General Assembly as merely voluntary on my part, to the performance of which, I am not compelled by the obligations of my legal duties. Therefore it would be impossible for me to avoid the conclusions I have stated, should I comply with these requests. Even an addition to the communication I am requested to make, of such a disclaimer as might suffice to acquit me of this imputation, would be in direct conflict with the expressed wishes of the General Assembly, and therefore I beg to beg to do in the most respectful manner, and I have to thank, with that respectful consideration which is due to that body, especially by every other department of this Government.

Placed thus, in a situation where my voluntary compliance with the wishes of the General Assembly must expose me to an imputation that, in justice to myself, I ought to disclaim; and should I do so, being constrained to depart from the course which my respect for them would induce me to adopt; no alternative is left for me, but to decline compliance with their request. This I beg to do in the most respectful manner, and I have to thank, with that respectful consideration which is due to that body, especially by every other department of this Government.

I have manifested so ready a disposition to prefer charges against others, let me in return prefer charges against you. You are, I think, entitled to the same interrogatories. If you are not bound to answer the writer of this, you are at least bound to make public your opinions, before you can expect the support of the friends of the State. Were you in favor of renewing the charter of the United States Bank? Do you approve of the charter which has been recently granted by the Legislature of Pennsylvania? And will you favor the introduction of Branches, or Agencies, in this State? Or, will you unite in forbidding their notes being circulated amongst us? Do you admit the right of Instruction, or do you approve of Mr. Manning's course in refusing to obey? Were you not in favor of South-Carolina nullification? Did you not, when in Congress, vote against the appropriation asked for by Gen. Jackson, for removing the Indians West of the Mississippi? If yes, what were your reasons assigned in your printed circular? When you shall "candidly and manfully" meet these questions, then the public will be able to decide how far you are entitled to its support.

A REPUBLICAN.

And neither set of resolutions brought forward by the joint committee on the subject in our last Legislature, goes one whit farther than Mr. Van Buren. He pronounces it wrong, "inexpedient," for Congress to touch the subject; and the committee's resolutions say no more—in fact, they concede the power to Congress. And these resolutions were supported and voted for by General Dudley himself.—Ed.

A WORD FOR THE POOR.

Sir: Under the head of "Bondage," you have, in your last week's Standard, given a very distressing account of the situation of the poor in Europe. I read it with some degree of confidence, as to the truth of the statement, till I came to the following: "Among the labouring classes of the industrious Scotch, meat, except on Sundays, is rarely used. Now what must be inferred from this, but that the people of Scotland are under bondage to the nobles; and that they are in a state of starvation, having, like the other countries mentioned, to subsist upon 'gruel, chestnuts,' &c. during six days of the week. Such, at least, would be the construction put upon it by all unacquainted with the present condition of that enlightened country."

Is it possible, under these circumstances, that industrious as they are, they could give to their sons that liberal education, which gains them honor and preferment in every quarter of the world? Instead of their being in subjection to the aristocracy, they are a free and independent people; pay no direct taxes; yet, by means of the Parochial Schools, established by law, and supported by the land holders, they are enabled to give all their children an education adapted to their station in life. They have meat at table every day; and though it grows not under a variety of complicated and highly seasoned dishes, yet is there not wanting an abundance of good substantial food, pleasing to the palate, and imparting a strength and vigour to the body, unknown to the partakers of the former. The wages of the poor, I confess, are small, owing to the dense population; yet their clothing and other necessities are in proportion.

How the Review, from which you copied, came to place such an article in its columns, I cannot determine; but this I know, that what little I have said is drawn from actual observation, as many of your most respectable citizens could testify. Spare, then, the feelings of all from the mother country; the fresh wound cannot bear to be too roughly handled. Do justice to the "industrious poor" by publishing this, and you will confer a favour on their friend and well wisher, from

MARJERY O' THE MONTY LOCHS.

We very cheerfully give place to the above. The article alluded to, we copied from some one of our exchange papers, (taken originally from the North American Review) as affording a striking contrast between the abundant means of subsistence in our country, and the scanty supplies

were introduced into the House of Delegates by Mr. Watkins, requesting the Speakers of the two Houses to transmit them; and after a good deal of discussion, adopted, by a vote of 79, over 40. In the Senate, they were also adopted the same day. So that his Excellency is foiled on that tack.

PREAMBLE AND RESOLUTION.

Whereas, a "preamble and resolutions" upon the subject of expunging from the journals of the Senate of the United States a resolution of that body, and relative to the right of instruction, were passed by this General Assembly, on the 20th day of the present month (February, 1836); and by one of the said resolutions the Governor of this Commonwealth was requested to transmit the same to each of the Senators from Virginia in the Congress of the United States, with a request that they lay the same before the Senate; and whereas the Governor of this Commonwealth has refused to transmit the aforesaid preamble and resolutions in pursuance of the request aforesaid, and contrary to the usage of the Executive of this State: Therefore,

Resolved, &c. That the Speakers of the Senate and House of Delegates, be, and they are hereby requested forthwith to transmit the aforesaid preamble and resolutions to each of the Senators from Virginia in the Congress of the United States, with a request that they lay the same before the Senate of the United States.

SUPPRESSION OF SMALL NOTES.

The near prospect of a large increase of the gold currency requires immediate and accelerated steps for the suppression of small notes, without which the gold which is coined at our mints will soon begin to be exported. The new gold coin already coined is about six millions of dollars: the Neapolitan indemnity, at \$1,250,000, is ordered home in gold; and the French indemnity, of which nearly four million are due, is also ordered home in the same coin. All this will go to our mint to be recoined as fast as it arrives. Add to these items, which of themselves amount to five millions of dollars, the customary supplies from our own mints of eight or nine hundred thousand dollars, and from commerce of one or two millions, and the gold coined at the U. States mint this year will amount to \$8,000,000, which added to the previous coinage, will make fourteen millions of gold coin. Now, the whole quantity of coin in the United States at the time of the panic, was computed at from twenty-five to thirty millions, so that we shall soon have half as much gold in circulation as we had in specie altogether two years ago. But to keep this gold in the country is now the question; for go it will,—go it must,—exported it inevitably will be, unless the circulation of notes under twenty dollars be stopped. All the Bank Whigs are now at work to multiply Banks with millions of capital, to flood the country with paper, an explosion, and then bringing forward the Bank of the United States, as the only thing that can regulate the currency and save the country. This is the game now playing, and the Democracy must begin in time. On this point Mr. Benton has moved in the Senate. A few days ago he gave notice, "That he would offer as an amendment to the general appropriation that should be under consideration, a clause enacting that no bank note of a less denomination than twenty dollars shall be hereafter offered in payment in any case whatsoever in which money is to be paid by the United States or Post Office Department; nor shall any bank note of any other denomination be so offered unless the same shall be payable and paid on demand in gold or silver coin at the place where issued, and which shall not be equivalent to specie at the place where offered and convertible into gold and silver upon the spot at the will of the holder, and without delay or loss to him." This is the first step towards stopping the circulation of notes under twenty dollars. It is certainly a very moderate step, for it only applies to the payment of notes from the federal Government, the receiving of them is not affected by this amendment, but will remain for a subsequent step. On the suppression of notes under twenty dollars, there will probably be much more unanimity than is usually seen in our legislation. Four sessions ago, in the modified recharter of the Bank of the United States, a clause was inserted by the unanimous voice of both Houses, for restricting the Bank from issuing notes under twenty dollars. Mr. WEBSTER moved that clause in the Senate. In his last annual message, President Jackson named twenty dollars as the limit for Bank notes; and in Holland's life of Van Buren, chapter XIX, Mr. Van Buren is shown to be in favor of the same policy. We may then anticipate great unanimity in Congress, in adopting not only the present motion of Mr. Benton for excluding small notes from federal payments, but also the next and natural one—excluding them from federal receipts. Globe.

Small Gold Coins.—Messrs. Gillet of New York, Smith of Maine, Patton of Virginia, Combs of North Carolina, Johnson of Louisiana, Holsey of Georgia, Ingalls of Pennsylvania, French of Kentucky and Calhoun of Mass.,—have been appointed a select committee to inquire into the expediency of providing by law for coining gold coins of the denominations of one, two, three and four dollars, and also whether any addition to the number of branch mints is required by the interest of the country.

Another Fire in New York.—We learn from the New York papers of Thursday, that a fire broke out that morning between 4 and 5 o'clock, in the spacious five story building, known as the "Methodist Book Concern," with the whole front and back destroyed, including the account books. The loss is estimated at Two hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars, of which only ten thousand were insured in the Greenwich company, and some thirty thousand in three of